

Application Number 10/687,989  
Amendment dated March 25, 2008  
Response to Office Action mailed December 27, 2007

#### REMARKS

This amendment is responsive to the Office Action dated December 27, 2007. Applicant has amended claims 1, 7-10, 13, 16, 23, 24, 27, 32, and 39 and canceled claims 3, 17, and 28. Claims 1, 2, 4-16, 18-27, and 29-41 are pending.

#### Claim Objections

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to claims 10, 24, and 32 citing informalities present within each of these claims. Applicant has amended claim 10 and 32 to correct for the misspelling of "specifies," such that claims 10 and 32 now recite a proper verb tense of "specifies."

Applicant, however, has not amended claims 10 and 32 to change "associated" to "associates." Applicant submits that claims 10 and 32 are proper in this regard, and the claim language states that the export limit command specifies an export limit for an "associated" one of the instances of the interior routing protocol. Applicant has also amended claim 24 to correct the improper modifier. Because all informalities have either been addressed or are acceptable in current form, Applicant requests withdrawal of the objections.

#### Allowable Subject Matter

In the Office Action, the Examiner indicated that claims 11-15, 18-26 and 33-41 have been allowed. The Examiner also indicated that claims 3, 4, 7, 8, 10, 17, 28, 29, 30 and 32 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

In this communication, Applicant has amended allowable dependent claims 7 and 8 to include the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Moreover, Applicant has amended claims 1, 16, and 27 to include, respectively, the limitations of allowable dependent claims 3, 17, and 28. Consequently, independent claims 1, 16 and 27 and claims dependent therefrom are allowable.

Further, Guerrero makes no mention of limiting, in response to a command from a client, a number of routes exported from an exterior routing protocol of a network device to an interior routing protocol of the network device, as recited, for example, by Applicant's currently

Application Number 10/687,989  
Amendment dated March 25, 2008  
Response to Office Action mailed December 27, 2007

amended claim 16. Moreover, paragraph [0038] of the Breitbart (US 2002/0147842) reference teaches to a predefined weight threshold, much as the Guerrero reference teaches of a predefined maximum table size, but fails to teach or suggest limiting, in response to a command from a client, a number of routes exported from an exterior routing protocol of a network device to an interior routing protocol of the network device.

### CONCLUSION

All claims in this application are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt allowance of all pending claims. Please charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to deposit account number 50-1778. The Examiner is invited to telephone the below-signed attorney to discuss this application.

Date:

March 25, 2008

SHUMAKER & SIEFFERT, P.A.  
1625 Radio Drive, Suite 300  
Woodbury, Minnesota 55125  
Telephone: 651.735.1100  
Facsimile: 651.735.1102

By:

  
Name: Kent J. Sieffert  
Reg. No.: 41,312